Remarks

In response to the Office Action mailed on July 26, 2007, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks.

In the present application, claims 1, 12, 17, 26, and 32 have been amended and claims 23 and 37 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. The claims have been amended to clarify that the transaction ID comprises a first plurality of digits in the first calling line number associated with the calling line used to establish the call path with the intelligent peripheral, the intelligent peripheral is identified by a second plurality of digits in the first calling line number associated with the calling line used to establish the call path with the intelligent peripheral, and the transaction ID is created and maintained on the SCP from the time the query is made to the SCP to obtain instructions for routing the communication until the call path between the calling line and the intelligent peripheral is dropped. Support for these claim amendments may be found on page 16, lines 1-13 in the Specification. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action, the Specification is objected to because of various informalities. Claims 1-10, 12-18, 20-23, 25-27, 29-33, and 35-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cartier et al. (US 6,795,543, hereinafter "Cartier") in view of McKinley, Jr. et al. (US 6,665,377, hereinafter "McKinley") and further in view of Schier et al. (US 6,233,316, hereinafter "Schier").

Specification

The Specification is objected to for containing various informalities including typographical errors. Various typographical errors identified in the Office Action and by the Applicants have been corrected as shown above in the section entitled "Amendments to the Specification." In view of the aforementioned corrections, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the Specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-10, 12-18, 20-23, 25-27, 29-33, and 35-37 are rejected as being unpatentable over Cartier in view of McKinley and Schier. Claims 23 and 37 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer rendering the rejection of these claims moot. The rejection of the remaining claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 1 specifies, in an advanced intelligent network, a method for using voice activated dialing (VAD) service with respect to originating a communication from a first calling line number. The method includes encountering an originating trigger including a feature code and querying a service control point (SCP) to obtain instructions for routing the communication, wherein the SCP determines whether a calling line associated with the first calling line number is subscribed to VAD service; if the calling line is subscribed to VAD service, establishing a call path between the calling line and an intelligent peripheral with voice recognition and processing capabilities, wherein the intelligent peripheral prompts collection of an utterance from the calling line, translates the utterance into identifying information associated with a called line and extracts a transaction identification (ID) from a called party parameter, wherein the transaction ID comprises a first plurality of digits in the first calling line number associated with the calling line used to establish the call path with the intelligent peripheral and wherein the intelligent peripheral is identified by a second plurality of digits in the first calling line number associated with the calling line used to establish the call path with the intelligent peripheral; receiving a message that includes the identifying information at the SCP; and dropping the call path between the calling line and the intelligent peripheral when the SCP receives the first calling line number and transaction ID from the intelligent peripheral, wherein the transaction ID is created and maintained on the SCP from the time the query is made to the SCP to obtain instructions for routing the communication until the call path between the calling line and the intelligent peripheral is dropped, and completing the communication between the calling line and the called line, wherein the SCP instructs a service switching point to route the communication to a called party.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Cartier, McKinley, and Schier fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in amended claim 1. For example, the aforementioned combination fails to disclose a transaction ID which comprises a first plurality of digits in the first calling line number associated with the calling line used to establish the call path with the intelligent peripheral, the intelligent peripheral being identified by a second plurality of digits in the first calling line number associated with the calling line used to establish the call path with the intelligent peripheral, and that the transaction ID is created and maintained on the SCP from the time the query is made to the SCP to obtain instructions for routing the

communication until the call path between the calling line and the intelligent peripheral is dropped.

Cartier discusses automating the handling of calls involving a request for operator services, e.g. 0- calls. (See Cartier column 4, lines 38-42.) Cartier discusses an IP 121 that plays an announcement prompting the caller to input the destination telephone number. Upon hearing this announcement, a caller at station 101 dials-in or speaks-in NPA-NXX-XXXX digits of the destination telephone number (step S104). The IP 121 forwards the input digits to the SSP (step not separately shown), and the SSP of CO 111 transmits a Call_Info_From_Resource message containing the destination number through one or more of the STPs 115 to the ISCP 119 (step S114). (See Cartier column 21, lines 42-49.) The ISCP 119 formulates an Analyze_Route type response message and sends that message back to the SSP CO 111. In step S124, the ISCP 119 sends that response message through one or more of the STPs 115 back to the end office CO 111. (See Cartier column 21, lines 51-53.)

McKinley discusses a networked system of voice-activated dialers (VAD). When a calling party wishes to make a telephone call to a called party, the calling party dials a pre-designated telephone number to connect with a first VAD. The calling party then utters the name of the called party, and additionally specifies a second VAD or other information that could be used to find a second VAD by means of which the called party may be reached. (See McKinley column 2, lines 1-7.) McKinley further discusses that the first VAD 102 is additionally configured to function as intelligent peripheral (IP), which is a part of an Intelligent Network (IN). The IP can be configured to perform some functions presently performed by other elements of a telephone network such as the Service Control Point (SCP) or a Service Switching Point (SSP). In general, an IP is configured to provide announcements to a party--such as a calling party--and collect information--such as additional digits required or a spoken utterance--to complete a call. (See McKinley column 4, lines 38-48.)

Schier discusses a method for completing a telephone call according to a caller's preferences without an excessive use of the caller's time to establish connection of the call to the desired number, and a method for adding the enhancement of a voice activated dialing option to a standard calling card which may be used by an individual quickly and inexpensively. (See Schier column 2, lines 12-20.) Schier discusses a VAD option service code which may be

"*VAD" or "#56", depending on the structure of the particular service provider's protocol. (See Schier column 6, lines 30-34.)

As discussed above and in contrast with amended claim 1, Cartier is directed to handling operator-requested telephone calls and fails to teach or suggest a transaction ID which comprises a first plurality of digits in the first calling line number associated with the calling line used to establish the call path with the intelligent peripheral and which is created and maintained on the SCP from the time the query is made to the SCP to obtain instructions for routing the communication until the call path between the calling line and the intelligent peripheral is dropped. Instead, Cartier discusses an IP which prompts a caller and collects a single selected input (e.g., a digit "9"). There appears to be no discussion in Cartier with respect to the transaction ID comprising a plurality of digits in a calling line number or with respect to the length of time the transaction ID is maintained on an SCP.

As discussed above and in contrast with amended claim 1, McKinley discloses an IP configured to provide announcements to a party--such as a calling party--and collect information--such as additional digits required or a spoken utterance--to complete a call, but fails to teach or suggest a transaction ID which comprises a first plurality of digits in the first calling line number associated with the calling line used to establish the call path with the intelligent peripheral and which is created and maintained on the SCP from the time the query is made to the SCP to obtain instructions for routing the communication until the call path between the calling line and the intelligent peripheral is dropped.

As discussed above and in contrast with amended claim 1, Schier fails to mention using an intelligent peripheral. Therefore, Schier cannot teach or suggest an IP extracting a transaction identification (ID) from a called party parameter, wherein the transaction ID comprises a first plurality of digits in the first calling line number associated with the calling line used to establish the call path with the intelligent peripheral and wherein the transaction ID is created and maintained on the SCP from the time the query is made to the SCP to obtain instructions for routing the communication until the call path between the calling line and the intelligent peripheral is dropped .

Based on the foregoing, the combination of Cartier, McKinley, and Schier fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features discussed above with respect to amended claim 1.

Therefore, amended claim 1 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Claims 2-10 depend from amended claim 1 and thus specify at least the same features. Therefore, these claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons and the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn. Amended independent claims 12, 17, 26, and 32 recite similar features as amended claim 1 and thus are allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn. Claims 13-16, 18, 20-22, 25, 27, 29-31, 33, and 35-36 depend from amended claims 12, 17, 26, and 32 and thus are also allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should be also withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicant's attorney at the number listed below.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD LLC.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(404) 954-5064

Date: January 28, 2008

/Alton Hornsby III/
Alton Hornsby III
Reg. No. 47,299

<div>

39262

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

</div>